



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,469	03/31/2004	Keiji Kashima	A-474	8406
802	7590	01/26/2007	EXAMINER	
PATENTTM.US P. O. BOX 82788 PORTLAND, OR 97282-0788			VU, PHU	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2871		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/26/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/816,469	KASHIMA, KEIJI
	Examiner Phu Vu	Art Unit 2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/25/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1-10, applicant states that Miyachi fails to disclose a vertical alignment mode liquid crystal layer and two sheet polarizers on both sides thereof, wherein a laminated retarder of claim 1 is interposed between one of the sheet polarizers and the liquid crystal cell) and that Miyachi discloses the cell being between the two laminated retarders. However, figure 6 of the reference clearly shows a liquid crystal cell placed to one side of both the limited retardation layers. Miyachi also discloses the display being of vertical alignment mode (see abstract).

Applicant also states that Uchiyama does not disclose a positive and negative retardation values. However this is irrelevant as this does not particularly matter in light of the fact that Uchiyama only discloses how the positive and negative films are defined with respect to the method they are formed and has no direct bearing on whether the final index of refraction values will correspond and also the primary reference teaches the proper index of refraction values (see claim 1)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made

to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi et. al US Patent No. 2003016390 in view of Uchiyama et al. US Patent No. 6638582.

Regarding claim 1 and 2 and 10, Miyachi discloses a laminated retardation layer by lamination of a positive index anisotropy with an optic axis in a to a layer plane ([0095]) and a retardation layer negative index anisotropy and an optical axis in a normal direction to the layer plane ([0097]). Miyachi does not explicitly teach the positive index anisotropy material to have inverse chromatic dispersion however applicant admits that a polycarbonate film having a fluorene skeleton has inverse chromatic dispersion. Uchiyama discloses a stretched polycarbonate polymer films with fluorene skeletons with excellent transparency, heat resistance, and productivity, which by applicant's admission will have inverse chromatic dispersion (column 9 lines 20-30 and column 9 line 67). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a polycarbonate film with fluorene skeleton to provide excellent transparency and heat resistance. Miyachi also discloses a vertical alignment mode LCD (see abstract) and positive and negative uniaxial films to one side of a LC cell (see fig. 6).

Regarding claim 9 with respect to claims 1 and 2, the limitation of the coating layer has a negative index of refraction and has axis normal to the plane was already claimed in claim 1 therefore this limitation has already been met.

Claim 3, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi and Uchiyama in view of Ishii US Patent No 5134507.

Regarding claim 3, Miyachi discloses all the limitations of claim 3 except a stretched cellulose acetate film as the polymer film having inverse chromatic dispersion. Ishii discloses an optically compensating plate comprised of a cellulose acetate film to achieve a high contrast ratio (see abstract and column 8 lines 1-10). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to use a cellulose acetate film to achieve a high contrast ratio.

Regarding claim 9 with respect to 3, the limitation of the coating layer has a negative index of refraction and has axis normal to the plane was already claimed in claim 1 therefore this limitation has already been met.

Regarding claim 10 with respect to claim 3, these limitations were previously met in the claim 1 rejection.

Claims 4 - 6 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi and Uchiyama (A) US Patent No. 6638582 in view of Uchiyama (B) US Patent No. 6800697.

Regarding claims 4 and 6, Uchiyama B discloses aromatic polyester polymers such as polycarbonates provide good heat resistance, film forming properties and optical characteristics (column 9 lines 20-30 and column 9 line 67). Uchiyama A, discloses mixture of retardation films having different chromatic dispersions to form a film having inverse chromatic dispersion which contribute to enhanced image quality

Art Unit: 2871

(see fig. 9 shows a film having inverse chromatic dispersion and column 3 lines 45-51).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a mixture of polyester polymers to control wavelength dispersion thus contributing to enhanced image quality.

Regarding claim 5, Uchiyama A discloses a polymer comprising a copolymer containing monomer units capable of yielding polymers having different chromatic dispersions and stretching said polymer to form a polymer with inverse chromatic dispersion (see column 3 line 65 – column 4 line 15) that has excellent retardation properties (see column 3 line 10). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply inverse chromatic dispersion to form retarders with an excellent retardation property.

Regarding claim 9 with respect to 4 and 5, the limitation of the coating layer has a negative index of refraction and has axis normal to the plane was already claimed in claim 1 therefore this limitation has already been met.

Regarding claim 10 with respect to claims 4 and 5, these limitations were previously met in the claim 1 rejection.

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyachi and Uchiyama in view of Matsuoka et al. US Patent No. 6444280.

Regarding claim 7, Miyachi and Uchiyama disclose all the limitations of claim 7 except a polymerizable chiral nematic used as the coating layer in a retardation film. Matsuoka discloses a retardation film comprising polymerizable chiral nematic liquid crystal to improve image quality and viewing angle characteristics (see abstract).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a polymerizable chiral nematic liquid crystal in a retarder to improve image quality and viewing characteristics.

Regarding claim 8, Miyachi and Uchiyama disclose all the limitations of claim 8 except a polymerizable discotic liquid crystal of homeotropic orientation layer in a coating layer of the retarder. Matsuoka discloses polymerizable discotic liquid crystal having a homeotropic orientation (see column 1 line 50 – column 2 line 9) to achieve optical compensation characteristics due to a large birefringence. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a polymerizable discotic liquid crystal of homeotropic alignment to achieve retardation characteristics due to a large birefringence.

Regarding claim 9 with respect to claims 7 and 8, the limitation of the coating layer has a negative index of refraction and has axis normal to the plane was already claimed in claim 1 therefore this limitation has already been met.

Regarding claim 10 with respect to claims 7 and 8, these limitations were previously met in the claim 1 rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phu Vu whose telephone number is (571)-272-1562. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-5PM M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim can be reached on (571)-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phu Vu
Examiner
AU 2871



ANDREW SCHECHTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER